



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/627,110

07/25/2003

Harry Michael Schell

9400-31

3761

39072

7590

03/30/2006

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.
P.O. BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/627,110		SCHELL, HARRY MICHAEL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries		2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 17 January 2006, to the original application filed 25 July 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-14, 16-17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
3. The rejection of claims 5, 15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1) in view of Luo ("Content Management on Server Farm with Layer-7 Routing") has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
4. The rejection of claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. Publication 2004/0001223 A1) in view of Digate (U.S. Publication 2004/0161080 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
5. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berard (U.S. Patent 6,906,817 B1) in view of Grigonis ("The Many Faces of Fax Personalities"), hereafter referred to as Grigonis.

As per claims 1 and 11, Berard discloses a method of routing files in a computer system including evaluating content of at least one file based on a routing policy or rules (See Berard, Column 6, lines 40-47 and lines 50-58).

Berard also discloses selectively routing the file based on the evaluated content of the file (See Berard, Column 7, lines 6-10).

While Berard does not disclose expressly that the file is a print file configured by an application for printing on a printer device, Berard does disclose that the document is created by its native application and that the system may be set up to recognize the document type and to transmit the document to its intended recipient based on the data extracted from the document, including an intended mode of transmission (See Berard, Column 7, lines 58-67, and Column 8, lines 1-9). Grigonis further discloses that the file may be distributed via printing (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Escher", third paragraph). Berard

and Grigonis are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing files based on file content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the file of Berard and Grigonis includes a print file, which is a file configured by an application for printing on a printer device. The motivation for this conclusion would have been that the document or file is transformed into an electronic document and its delivery is automated to multiple platforms, including distributed printing, as disclosed by Grigonis, and therefore is configured appropriately (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Esker", third paragraph).

As per claims 2 and 12, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses searching the content of the print file for one or more keywords that are defined by the routing policy (See Berard, Column 6, lines 50-60).

As per claims 3 and 13, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses comparing the content of the print file to one or more data structures that are defined by the routing policy (See Berard, Column 6, lines 58-67, and Column 7, lines 1-5).

As per claims 4 and 14, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses comparing the content of the print file to the routing policy (See Berard, Column 6, lines 50-62). Berard does not disclose expressly that the settings are contained in an INI file, however, it is well known in the art that an INI file contains system configuration or setting information (See definition of INI file, Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, Page 273).

As per claims 6 and 16, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses selectively routing the print file to a non-printer device instead of to a printer device in response to the evaluated content of the print file (See Berard, Column 7, lines 6-10).

As per claims 7 and 17, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 6 and 16 as described above. Grigonis also discloses posting the print file on a Web page (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Esker", third paragraph). Berard and Grigonis are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing files based on file content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to post the file of Berard on a Web page, as disclosed by Grigonis. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the file to be delivered automatically to multiple platforms, such as via the web (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Esker", third paragraph). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Grigonis with Berard for the benefit of delivering the file automatically to multiple platforms, including the web, to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 17.

As per claims 8 and 18, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses emailing the print file to one or more users on a computer network based on the content of the print file and the routing policy (See Berard, Column 7, lines 6-10 and lines 61-63).

As per claims 9 and 19, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard also discloses sending information from the print file to a database application (See Berard, Column 8, lines 31-35). It is well known in

the art that "importing information" is equivalent to sending information, or bringing information from one application or program to another (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, definition of "import").

As per claims 10 and 20, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 19 as described above. Berard also discloses rules that extract data such as a telephone number or email address from the file to known fields within the receiving application as defined by the routing policy (See Berard, Column 6, lines 40-47 and lines 50-67).

7. Claims 5, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berard (U.S. Patent 6,906,817 B1) in view of Grigonis ("The Many Faces of Fax Personalities"), hereafter referred to as Grigonis, as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Luo ("Content Management on Server Farm with Layer-7 Routing"), hereafter referred to as Luo.

As per claims 5 and 15, Berard and Grigonis disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 11 as described above. Berard and Grigonis do not disclose expressly renaming the print file. Luo discloses renaming a file to support content-based routing (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.2, paragraph 1). Berard, Grigonis and Luo are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing electronic information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the renaming of a file of Luo with the method of Berard and Grigonis. The motivation for doing so would have been to convert the original

name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.3, paragraph 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Luo with Berard and Grigonis for the benefit of converting the original name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 15.

As per claim 21, Berard discloses a method of routing files in a computer system including searching content of a file to identify one or more keywords that are defined by a routing policy or rules (See Berard, Column 6, lines 40-47 and lines 50-58).

While Berard does not disclose expressly that the file is a print file configured by an application for printing on a printer device, Berard does disclose that the document is created by its native application and that the system may be set up to recognize the document type and to transmit the document to its intended recipient based on the data extracted from the document, including an intended mode of transmission (See Berard, Column 7, lines 58-67, and Column 8, lines 1-9). Grigonis further discloses that the file may be distributed via printing (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Esker", third paragraph). Berard and Grigonis are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing files based on file content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the file of Berard and Grigonis includes a print file, which is a file configured by an application for printing on a printer device. The motivation for this conclusion would have been that the document or file is transformed into an electronic document and its delivery is automated to multiple platforms, including distributed printing, as disclosed by Grigonis, and therefore is configured appropriately (See Grigonis, Page 5, "Esker", third paragraph).

Berard and Grigonis also do not disclose expressly selectively renaming the print file based on identifying keywords in the print file instead of routing the print file to a printing device. Luo discloses renaming a file to support content-based routing (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.2, paragraph 1). Berard, Grigonis and Luo are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of routing electronic information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the renaming of a file of Luo with the method of Berard and Grigonis. The motivation for doing so would have been to convert the original name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name for delivery to the receiving application (See Luo, Page 1137, Column 2, Section 4.3, paragraph 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Luo with Berard and Grigonis for the benefit of converting the original name of the file into a fixed length and formatted name to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is noted that Applicant's amendment to the independent claims significantly changes the scope of the invention when interpreted as a whole, therefore necessitating the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2176

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
3/27/2016